



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,908	02/08/2002	David William Kinnard	00-SM5-0142 (ATI-0009)	2272
23413	7590	02/05/2004		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002				
EXAMINER ZERVIGON, RUDY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1763				

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,908

Applicant(s)

KINNARD ET AL.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 32-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 32-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 24, 2003 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-14, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) in view of Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738). Hoke teaches a reactor assembly (Figure 3; column 7, lines 30-65) comprising:

- i. A base unit (20);
- ii. A optionally stationary chuck assembly (30,23) disposed in a cavity (30a,20a) of the base unit, wherein the chuck assembly comprises a support (23) having a surface capable of receiving a substrate (63);
- iii. A quartz (applicant's specification [0042]; column 7, lines 30-35) process chamber (11), transparent to UV and IR light sources, comprising a top wall (25), a bottom wall (opposite 25), and sidewalls (not labeled; perpendicular to 25) extending therefrom, wherein the process chamber is coupled to the base unit;

- iv. An inlet manifold assembly (15) in fluid communication with a first opening baffle plate / flow restrictor (12) of the process chamber in a selected one of the sidewalls (12), wherein the inlet manifold assembly comprises a flow-shaping portion (15a) adapted to laterally elongate a gas and/or reactant flow in the process chamber; and
- v. An exhaust manifold assembly (16, 16b, 17) in fluid communication with a second opening (16b) of the process chamber in the sidewall diametrically opposed from the selected one (12) of the sidewalls, the exhaust manifold assembly is adapted to receive the gas and/or reactant flow from the process chamber at about a plane parallel to the surface of the substrate
  - a. The exhaust manifold assembly further comprises an exhaust receiving portion (16, 13) and a rectangular flow restrictor plate (“rectangular aperture”; not labeled; column 10, lines 4-9) having one passageway (16b), wherein the flow restrictor is affixed to an opening of the exhaust receiving portion and is adapted to restrict the gas and/or reactant flow through the opening from the process chamber into the exhaust receiving portion
- vi. The triangular flow-shaping portion (15a; Figure 3) of the inlet manifold assembly is adapted to introduce the gas and/or reactant flow into the process chamber at about a plane parallel to a surface of the substrate (column 10, lines 4-21); the flow-shaping portion adapted to laterally elongate a gas and/or a reactant flow into the process chamber – diffuser portion 15a

Art Unit: 1763

- vii. A light source assembly (IR light source radiation, 31; column 9, lines 36-60) in operable communication with the transparent top wall for projecting radiation into the process chamber

Hoke does not teach a cylindrical opening extending through the bottom wall to the top wall to define a substantially cylindrically shaped interior region. Hoke does not teach a fluid communication between his inlet manifold assembly (15) and the first sidewall opening of the process chamber being free from a baffle plate (12).

Watanabe teaches a similar horizontal-type MOCVD cylindrical reactor vessel (2, Figures 1-3; column 3, lines 29-50; ). As such Watanabe teaches a cylindrical opening (volume created by 2) extending through the bottom wall (lower portion of 2; Figure 3) to the top wall (upper portion of 2; Figure 3) to define a substantially cylindrically shaped interior region. Watanabe further teaches a fluid communication (15; Figure 1) between his inlet manifold assembly (6; Figure 1) and the first sidewall opening (9; Figure 1) of his process chamber being free of a baffle plate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Hoke's square reactor with Watanabe's cylindrical reactor and to remove Hoke's baffle plate.

Motivation to replace Hoke's square reactor with Watanabe's cylindrical reactor and to remove Hoke's baffle plate is to generate a laminar flow of reactant gasses as taught by Watanabe (column 2, lines 14-18; Figure 4; column 5, lines 35-45) and for reducing material costs of manufacture, respectively. Further, Watanabe supports laminar flow absent a baffle plate (column 5, lines 29-40).

Art Unit: 1763

4. Claims 4 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738) in view of Raaijmakers (USPat. 6,383,330 B1). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach that his top wall of the process chamber is removable. Raaijmakers teaches a similar horizontal flow deposition chamber (Figure 6; column 11, lines 16-67). Specifically, Raaijmakers teaches that his top wall (112) of the process chamber (110) is removable (Figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make Hoke and Watanabe top wall of the process chamber removable from the process chamber as taught by Raaijmakers.

Motivation to make Hoke and Watanabe top wall of the process chamber removable from the process chamber as taught by Raaijmakers is for servicing and/or repairing the chamber components (column 1, lines 5-11).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738) in view of Mikio Takagi (JP02-152251<sup>1</sup>). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach that the bottom wall of the base unit is adapted to be stackedly attached to a second reactor assembly. Mikio Takagi teaches, per the translation, a vertical semiconductor manufacturing system (Page 2) including base units (2) adapted to be stackedly attached to plural reactor assemblies (Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reproduce and vertically stack the Hoke and Watanabe reactor assembly as taught by Mikio Takagi.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to STIC Translation

Motivation to reproduce and vertically stack the Hoke and Watanabe reactor assembly as taught by Mikio Takagi is to minimize and effectively utilize expensive clean room space (page 7).

6. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738), in view of Tepman et al (USPat. 5,228,501). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach that his chuck assembly comprises Applicant's means for regulating a substrate's temperature (specification [0039]). Tepman teaches a chuck assembly (Figure 1) including identical means for regulating a substrate's temperature (column 6, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the Hoke and Watanabe chuck assembly with Tepman's chuck assembly including identical means for regulating a substrate's temperature.

Motivation to replace the Hoke and Watanabe chuck assembly with Tepman's chuck assembly is to dissipate heat during processing (column 6, lines 45-51).

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738), in view of Gale et al (USPat. 4,839,145). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach a third opening in the sidewall for transporting the substrate into the interior region of the processing chamber. Gale teaches a similar cross-flow CVD reactor (Figure 20) including a third opening (904, first opening - 908, second opening - 910) in the sidewall for transporting the substrate (920) into the interior region of the processing chamber (not labeled; holding substrates 920).

Art Unit: 1763

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a third opening to the Hoke and Watanabe sidewall for transporting the substrate into the interior region of the processing chamber as taught by Gale.

Motivation to add a third opening to the Hoke and Watanabe sidewall for transporting the substrate into the interior region of the processing chamber as taught by Gale is to provide added access to the processing chamber.

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738), in view of Chazee (USPat. 5,190,592). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach that exhaust receiving portion is triangularly shaped. Chazee teaches a similar film deposition chamber over substrates (Figure 1; column 1, lines 5-17, 43-66) including an exhaust receiving portion (24; column 2, lines 9-12) that is triangularly shaped.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the Hoke and Watanabe exhaust receiving portion with Chazee's exhaust receiving portion that is triangularly shaped as taught by Chazee.

Motivation to replace the Hoke and Watanabe exhaust receiving portion with Chazee's exhaust receiving portion that is triangularly shaped as taught by Chazee is to "regulate the overflow and suction rate of the residual vapour phase" (column 2, lines 9-12).

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke et al (USPat. 5,077,875) and Watanabe et al (USPat. 5,370,738), in view of Won et al (USPat. 6,355,108 B1). Hoke and Watanabe are discussed above. Hoke and Watanabe do not teach an



Art Unit: 1763

exhaust flow restrictor made of anodized aluminum. Won teaches anodized aluminum parts (22) in a film deposition chamber (Figure 3; column 6, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate the Hoke and Watanabe rectangular aperture from anodized aluminum as taught by Won.

Motivation to fabricate the Hoke and Watanabe rectangular aperture from anodized aluminum as taught by Won is to fabricate Hoke's rectangular aperture from an alternate and equivalent material.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed October 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Applicant's arguments are solely directed to the amended subject matter in claims 1 and 32. In response, the Examiner directs Applicant to the body of the new claim rejections above as necessitated by Applicant's amendment to claims 1 and 32.

#### ***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272.1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official after final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9311. The official before final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9310. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be

Application/Control Number: 10/071,908

Page 9

Art Unit: 1763

directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, at (571) 272-1439.

*Gregory L. Mills*  
2/2/4  
10:42